

Appl. No. 09/728,908
Amdt. dated 02/08/2005
Reply to Office action of 09/08/2004

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed September 8, 2004.

Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 18-22, 24, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Aatresh (6,067,301).

Claims, 1, 9, 17, 20, and 28, applicant has amended the claims to include the elements of a plurality of partitions and a plurality of class of service buffers (CoSBs). Each logical interface includes a plurality of partitions and a plurality of CoSBs. Aatresh does not disclose the claimed structure as amended.

Claims 2, 10, 18, 21, and 29, applicant has cancelled the claims.

Claims 3, 11, 19, 22, and 30, applicant has amended the claims to provide that each of said plurality of CoSBs, each of said plurality of partitions, and each of said first plurality of CoSs include a maximum allowable bandwidth usage. Aatresh does not disclose providing a maximum allowable bandwidth with every entity as now claimed.

Claims 5, 13, and 24, applicant has amended the claims to provide that each of said plurality of CoSBs, each of said plurality of partitions, and each of said first plurality of CoSs include a minimum bandwidth guarantee. Aatresh does not disclose providing a minimum bandwidth guarantee with every entity as now claimed.

Appl. No. 09/728,908
Amdt. dated 02/08/2005
Reply to Office action of 09/08/2004

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 9-11, 13, 18-22, 24, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Aatresh.

4. The Examiner rejects claims 6-8, 14-16, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Aatresh (6,067,301) or, in the alternative, obvious over Aatresh.

Claims 6-8, 14-16, and 25-27, applicant has amended the claims to provide that the line card checks the minimum bandwidth guarantee and the maximum bandwidth usage of each of the plurality of CoSBs, each of the plurality of partitions, and each of said the plurality of CoSs and prevents a change in any of these entities if the change would result in improper minimum bandwidth relationships for the line card. Aatresh does not disclose checking of every entity as claimed nor preventing a change in configuration of the line card if the change would result in improper minimum bandwidth relationships for the line card.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6-8, 14-16, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Aatresh or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aatresh.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

6. The Examiner rejects claims 4, 12, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aatresh (6,067,301).

Claims 4, 12, and 23, as explained in the remarks of claims, 1, 9, and 20 (parent claims), Aatresh does not disclose the claimed structure as amended. The Examiner admits that Aatresh does not teach wherein the maximum allowable bandwidth is the maximum amount of

Appl. No. 09/728,908
Amdt. dated 02/08/2005
Reply to Office action of 09/08/2004

bandwidth that any logical entity can reserve. The Examiner observes that it would have been obvious to implement weighted fair queuing in Aatresh. Applicant has amended claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 22, and 23 to provide that each of said plurality of CoSBs, each of said plurality of partitions, and each of said first plurality of CoSs include a maximum allowable bandwidth usage that is the maximum amount of bandwidth usage that these entities can reserve. Weighted fair queuing does not teach or suggest providing a maximum allowable bandwidth with every entity as now claimed.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4, 12, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aatresh.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 02/08/2005

By

James Henry
Reg. No. 41,064
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)